

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application.

Claims 2-4 and 6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Wolff in view of Iyriboz.

Claim 2 recites:

“volume data from the volume data storage unit is transmitted to the destination image data server computer and additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests is copied from the operative image data server computer to the destination image data server computer, and the destination image data server computer is made to execute the data processing.”

The subject matter of claim 1 is a distributed image processing system that provides for the independent transferring of volume data, which is large in size, and rendering parameters (i.e., “additional information”), which are small in size. Volume data is transferred from the volume data storage unit to the destination server computer. Volume data is not transferred from the operative image data server computer to the destination server computer, which would slow current image processing. Rendering parameters (i.e., “additional information”), however, are transferred from the operative image data server computer to the destination server computer, which does not appreciably slow current image processing.

Applicant submits that the combination of Wolff and Iyriboz fails to teach or suggest copying “additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests” from an operative image data server computer to a destination image data

server computer. As discussed in applicant's Response "D" filed on April 13, 2007, Iyriboz fails to teach copying "additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests" from an operative image data server computer to a destination image data server computer. The Office action at page 8 attempts to explain how such limitations could be taught by the combination of Wolff and Iyriboz, and asserts that the additional information can be part of the client I/O request in Wolff (see Figs. 7A and 7B). Wolff teaches that a node 4 server sends a redirect packet 700 to the aware client 3 (see Fig. 7A), and the aware client 3 redirects I/Os along path 704 through a node 3 server (24:51-25:11). Assuming, *arguendo*, that Wolff's client I/O request can include "additional information", such information is not copied from an operative server to a destination server, but from the client 3 to a server. Applicant submits that the cited combination of references fails to teach or suggest copying "additional information including scale-up factor data, angle data, and position data of the image requests" from an operative image data server computer to a destination image data server computer, and that claim 2 is allowable over the cited combination.

Claim 2 recites, "if the same volume data as the volume data handled by the operative image data server computer are not present in the suspended image data server computer as a destination of the decided switching, the server manager performs a control function wherein the volume data from the volume data storage unit is transmitted to the destination image data server computer." The Office action at page 3 asserts that the noted limitations are taught by Wolff at 8:16-18. Wolff teaches remapping between memory resources 118A-B and each server 104C-106C via path 92B (8:16-24). In the present invention, "data remapping" of "additional data" is executed between memory resources of each image data server computer. However, "data remapping" of volume data is executed between a volume data storage unit and image data

server computers. Accordingly, the load of the operative image data server computer is reduced, volume data is handled efficiently, and the suspension of data processing is minimized.

Claims 3, 4 and 6 depend from claim 2 and are allowable over the combination of Wolff and Iyriboz for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the arguments provided above, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-4 and 6. It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB1-36609.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Brad C. Spencer, Reg. No. 57076

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700  
Date: September 24, 2007